

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **19 February 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-14. Examiner rejected claim 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Hendel (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0120332, hereinafter “Hendel”), and Bloch (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0043564, hereinafter “Bloch”). Examiner rejected claim 8, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Hendel, Bloch, and Pekkala (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0085493, hereinafter “Pekkala”). Examiner rejected claims 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Hendel and Pekkala. Examiner objected to claims 42-43 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated the claims would be allowable if rewritten.

Restriction Requirement

In a phone conversation on 13 January 2008, Applicant provisionally elected with traverse to pursue prosecution for claims 1-14 and 30-43. Applicant hereby affirms the election without traverse.

Allowable Subject Matter

Examiner objected to claim 42 as being dependent upon a rejected claim. Examiner indicated claim 42 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 30, and 32 to include the limitations of claim 42 and any intervening claims. Applicant has cancelled claims 39, 40, and 42. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 30 and 32 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that dependent claims which depend upon these independent claims are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony Jones/
Anthony Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 5 June 2008

Anthony Jones
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com